arXiv:1412.3334v1 [cs.CC] 10 Dec 2014

Computational Complexity of Competitive Diffusion on (Un)weighted Graphs

Takehiro Ito[1], Yota Otachi[2], Toshiki Saitoh[3], Hisayuki Satoh[1], Akira Suzuki[1], Kei Uchizawa[4], Ryuhei Uehara[2], Katsuhisa Yamanaka[5], and Xiao Zhou[1]

[1] Tohoku University,
{takehiro, h.satoh, a.suzuki, zhou}@ecei.tohoku.ac.jp
[2] Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology,
{otachi, uehara}@jaist.ac.jp
[3] Kobe University,
saitoh@eedept.kobe-u.ac.jp
[4] Yamagata University,
uchizawa@yz.yamagata-u.ac.jp
[5] Iwate University,
yamanaka@cis.iwate-u.ac.jp

Abstract. Consider an undirected graph modeling a social network, where the vertices represent users, and the edges do connections among them. In the competitive diffusion game, each of a number of players chooses a vertex as a seed to propagate his/her opinion, and then it spreads along the edges in the graphs. The objective of every player is to maximize the number of vertices the opinion infects. In this paper, we investigate a computational problem of asking whether a pure Nash equilibrium exists in the competitive diffusion game on unweighed and weighted graphs, and present several negative and positive results. We first prove that the problem is W[1]-hard when parameterized by the number of players even for unweighted graphs. We also show that the problem is NP-hard even for series-parallel graphs with positive integer weights, and is NP-hard even for forests with arbitrary integer weights. Furthermore, we show that the problem for forest of paths with arbitrary weights is solvable in pseudo-polynomial time; and it is solvable in quadratic time if a given graph is unweighted. We also prove that the problem for chain, cochain, and threshold graphs with arbitrary integer weights is solvable in polynomial time.

1 Introduction

Social networks plays an important role in human interactions in recent years, through which we can propagate ideas, findings, innovations and trends. An action some influential users exhibit spreads over social networks, and greatly affects public opinion formation. The dynamics of such diffusion process is a major research subject on game-theoretic analysis of social networks. In particular, Alon *et al.* [1] focused on a setting of a diffusion process where a number of players compete to propagate their opinions on a topic over a social network. In



Fig. 1. Example of competitive diffusion with $k = 3$ players. (a) The graph G and weight w; numbers in the gray squares are weights. (b) p_1, p_2 and p_3 choose v_1, v_7 and v_9 in G, respectively; thus a strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s} = (v_1, v_7, v_9)$. (c) Each player dominates the neighbor. (d) The game ends; the two gray vertices are neutral. Consequently, $U_1(\boldsymbol{s}) = 2, U_2(\boldsymbol{s}) = 3$ and $U_3(\boldsymbol{s}) = 1$.

this setting, each player chooses a user who acts as a seed of the opinion, and then the opinion spreads along the connections in a social network in discrete time step. The objective of every player is to maximize the number of users their opinions infect. This setting models, for example, a situation where a number of firms compete in a specific market, and want to advertise their products via viral marketing; each firm chooses an influential user to maximize the number of users who buy their product. Alon *et al.* formalized this process as the *competitive diffusion game* on unweighted graphs. In this paper, we generalize the game to weighted graphs, and investigate its computational complexity. We below define the game more formally.

In the competitive diffusion game, a social network is modeled by an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, where the vertex set V represents users, the edge set E does their connections; thus, their neighbors do friends they communicate. After some user exhibits an opinion, it spreads along the edges in the graph. We then define a weight function $w : V \to \mathbb{Z}$ which represents a level of importance of each user; we admit that a weight on a vertex can be negative to express, for example, a very demanding customer. For a positive integer k, we define $[k] = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$, and call the k players $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_k$. The competitive diffusion game (k, G, w) proceeds as follows. (See Fig. 1(a)-(d) for an explicit example.) At time one, each player chooses a vertex in V; suppose a player p_i, $i \in [k]$, chooses a vertex $v \in V$. If any other player p_j, $i \neq j$, does not choose the vertex v, then p_i *dominates* v; and otherwise (that is, if there exists a player p_j, $i \neq j$, who chooses v), v becomes a *neutral* vertex which no player can dominate in the following time steps. For each time t, $t \geq 2$, a vertex $v \in V$ is dominated by a player p_i at time t if (i) v is neither neutral nor dominated by any player by time $(t-1)$, and (ii) v has a neighbor dominated by p_i, but does not have a neighbor dominated by any player p_j, $i \neq j$. If v satisfies (i) and there are two or more players who dominate neighbors of v, then v becomes a neutral vertex at time t. The game ends when no player can dominate a vertex any more.



(a) Time 1 (b) Time 7

Fig. 2. The vertex v_3 becomes neutral at time 2, and consequently, p_3 dominates v_4 at time 7.

Let $\boldsymbol{s} = (s^{(1)}, s^{(2)}, \ldots, s^{(k)}) \in V^k$ be the vector of vertices which the players choose at the beginning of the game. We call $\boldsymbol{s}$ a *strategy profile*. For every $i \in [k]$, we define a *utility* $U_i(\boldsymbol{s})$ of p_i for $\boldsymbol{s}$ as the sum of the weights of the vertices which p_i dominates at the end. (See Fig. 1(d).)

We note that a neutral vertex is a key notion of the competitive diffusion game; it sometimes gives critical effect on the result. (See Fig 2.) This contrasts to a similar game, called Voronoi game, where a player can dominate all the nearest vertices; if there is a vertex whose distances to strategies of two or more players tie, then they do not dominate but share the vertex [2,4,13].

For an index $i \in [k]$, we define $(\boldsymbol{s}_{-i}, v')$ as a strategy profile such that p_i chooses v' instead of $s^{(i)}$, but any other player p_j, $i \neq j$, chooses $s^{(j)}$: $(\boldsymbol{s}_{-i}, v) = (s^{(1)}, s^{(2)}, \ldots, s^{(i-1)}, v', s^{(i+1)}, \ldots, s^{(k)})$. For simplicity, we write $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}_{-i}, v')$ for $U_i((\boldsymbol{s}_{-i}, v'))$. Then, if $\boldsymbol{s}$ satisfies

$$U_i(\boldsymbol{s}_{-i}, v') \leq U_i(\boldsymbol{s}) \tag{1}$$

for every $i \in [k]$ and every $v' \in V$, we say that $\boldsymbol{s}$ is a *(pure) Nash equilibrium*. The strategy profile given in Fig. 1(b) is, in fact, a Nash equilibrium.

Since Alon *et al.* proposed the competitive diffusion game in [1], several results are obtained for the game on unweighted graphs. In the same paper, Alon *et al.* observed that there exists an unweighted graph G of diameter three such that $(2, G, w)$ does not admit a Nash equilibrium [1]. Takehara improved their result and showed that there exists an unweighted graph G of diameter two such that $(2, G, w)$ does not admit a Nash equilibrium [11]. (Besides, they refute a theorem given in [1].) Small and Mason considered the case where a social network has a tree structure, and show that, for any unweighted tree G, $(2, G, w)$ has a Nash equilibrium [10].

In this paper, we consider a problem, named Competitive Diffusion, of deciding whether, given the number k, a graph G and weight function w, the competitive diffusion game (k, G, w) has a Nash equilibrium. Recently, Etesami and Baser studied the problem, and showed that Competitive Diffusion is a NP-complete problem [3]. We strengthen their result, and generalize it in terms

of weight functions. More formally, we obtain the following three negative results: (i) Competitive Diffusion is W[1]-hard when parameterized by the number of players even for unweighted graphs; (ii) Competitive Diffusion is NP-complete even for series-parallel graphs with positive integer weights; and (iii) Competitive Diffusion is NP-complete even for forests with arbitrary integer weights. Our results imply that the computational complexity of Competitive Diffusion may be much influenced by weights on vertices. We note that the results given in [3] does not imply ours.

Furthermore, we obtain several positive results on Competitive Diffusion. For forests of paths, we prove that Competitive Diffusion is solvable in pseudo-polynomial time. In particular, we give a quadratic-time algorithm for forests of unweighted paths. For chain, cochain, and threshold graphs with arbitrary integer weights, we also provide polynomial time algorithms. To the best of our knowledge, no nontrivial algorithm is known even for unweighted version of Competitive Diffusion.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present our hardness results for Competitive Diffusion. In Section 3, we give algorithms for forests of paths. In Section 4, we provide an algorithm for chain, cochain, and threshold graphs.

2 Complexity of Competitive Diffusion

In this section, we show that Competitive Diffusion is basically hard computational problem. In Section 2.1, we show W[1]-hardness for unweighted graphs. In Sections 2.2 and 2.3, we show NP-completeness for series-parallel graphs with nonnegative integer weights and NP-completeness for forests with arbitrary integer weights, respectively.

2.1 Unweighted Graphs

In this section, we prove that the problem is $W[1]$-hard for the number of players, as in the following theorem.

Theorem 1. Competitive Diffusion *is $W[1]$-hard even for unweighted graphs when parameterized by the number of players.*

We prove the theorem by reduction from a well-known $W[1]$-hard problem, Independent Set [5]. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a positive integer k, Independent Set asks whether there exists an independent set I of size at least k, where a set $I(\subseteq V)$ is called an independent set if there is no pair of vertices $u, v \in I$ such that $(u, v) \in E$. Below we show that, given G and k, one can construct a competitive diffusion game $(k + 3, G', w')$ such that G has an independent set I of size $|I| \geq k$ if and only if $(k + 3, G', w')$ has a pure Nash equilibrium, where G' and w' is a graph and weight obtained from G. Let $n = |V|$ and $m = |E|$, and let δ_v be the degree of v for every $v \in V$.



Fig. 3. Unweighted graph G'. (a) Graph A. (b) Graph B; The black vertices originate from G, and compose V.

[Construction of G' and w']

The graph G' consists of two disjoint component graphs $A = (V_A, E_A)$ and $B = (V_B, E_B)$.

We obtain the graph A as follows. We construct a path of four vertices a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4; and make $2n$ vertices $a'_1, a'_2, \ldots, a'_n$ and $a''_1, a''_2, \ldots, a''_n$. Then we connect a_1 to $a'_1, a'_2, \ldots, a'_n$, and connect a_4 to $a''_1, a''_2, \ldots, a''_n$. See Fig. 3(a). We obtain the graph B from the original graph G as follows. For every edge $e = (u, v) \in E$, we add a vertex b_e subdividing e. Then, for each $v \in V$, we make a set D_v of $n - \delta_v$ vertices, and connect v to every $u \in D_v$. Lastly we make a vertex b and λ vertices $b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_\lambda$, where λ is a sufficiently large number satisfying $\lambda = \Theta(n^3)$, and connect b to every $v \in V$, and connect b to $b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_\lambda$.

Thus, $G' = (V', E')$ is such a graph that $V' = V_A \cup V_B$ and $E' = E_A \cup E_B$. We define the weight of every vertex as one: $w' : V' \to \{1\}$.

We now show that G has an independent set I of size $|I| \geq k$ if and only if $(k + 3, G', w')$ has a pure Nash equilibrium. We first verify the sufficiency.

Lemma 1. *If there exists an independent set $I \subseteq V$ satisfying $k \leq |I|$, then $(k+3, G', w')$ has a Nash equilibrium.*

Proof. Let $I' \subseteq I$ be an arbitrary fixed subset of I such that $|I'| = k$, and let $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k$ be the vertices in I'. Then the following strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is shown to be a Nash equilibrium.

The strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}^*$: For each $i \in [k]$, p_i chooses v_i. The player p_{k+1} chooses b. The players p_{k+2} and p_{k+3} choose a_2 and a_3, respectively.

Let us estimate the utility of each player. Firstly, consider p_i for every $i \in [k]$. The player p_i chooses v_i, and v_i is connected to $n - \delta_v$ vertices in D_v and δ_v subdivisions. Since I' is an independent set, p_i dominates all these vertices. However, at time two, p_{k+1} dominates every vertex in $V \backslash I'$. Thus, for every $i \in [k]$,

$$U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = n + 1. \tag{2}$$

Secondly, consider the player p_{k+1}. Since p_{k+1} dominates at least b and $b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_\lambda$,

$$U_{k+1}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) \geq \lambda + 1. \tag{3}$$

Lastly, we have

$$U_{k+2}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = U_{k+3}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = n + 2. \tag{4}$$

Below we show that $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is a Nash equilibrium by verifying Eq. (1). We omit the cases where a player changes the strategy to a vertex chosen by another player.

(i) $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_k$

Consider an arbitrary player p_i, $i \in [k]$. If p_i chooses a vertex in V_A, then, clearly p_i dominates at most $n + 1$ vertices. If p_i chooses b_e for some $e \in E$ or $u \in D_v$ for some v, then p_i dominates exactly one vertex due to p_{k+1}. Suppose p_i chooses $v' \in V$. If there exists $e = (u, v')$ such that $u \in I'$, p_i does not dominate a vertex b_e, and hence p_i dominates less than $n + 1$ vertices. Otherwise, p_i dominates exactly $n + 1$ vertices, as in Eq. (2). Thus, the utility of p_i does not increase from Eq. (2).

(ii) p_{k+1}

If p_{k+1} chooses any vertex in V_A, p_{k+1} dominates at most $n + 1$ vertices. If p_{k+1} chooses any vertex in $V_B \backslash \{b\}$, p_{k+1} cannot dominate b, and hence dominates at most

$$|V_B \backslash \{b, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_\lambda\}| = n + m + \sum_{v \in V} (n - \delta_v) = n^2 + n - m.$$

Since $\lambda = \Theta(n^3)$, the utility of p_{k+1} does not increase from Eq. (3).

(iii) p_{k+2}, p_{k+3}

Both of p_{k+2} and p_{k+3} dominate at most $n+1$ vertices, as same in (i). Thus, the utilities of p_{k+2} and p_{k+3} do not increase from Eq. (4).

We can also verify the necessity which complete the proof of the theorem.

Lemma 2. *If $(k+3, G', w')$ has a Nash equilibrium, then we can construct an independent set I of G such that $|I| = k$.*

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ be an arbitrary Nash equilibrium of $(k+3, G', w')$. We say that a strategy profile s is *standard* if s satisfies the following conditions:

(A.1) k players choose different k vertices in $V \subseteq V'$.
(A.2) A player choose $b \in V'$.
(A.3) Two players choose $a_2, a_3 \in V'$.

We then have the following proposition whose proof will be given in the appendix.

Proposition 1. *If $(k+3, G', w')$ has a Nash equilibrium $\boldsymbol{s}^*$, then $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is standard.*

Proposition 1 implies that $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is standard. Thus, without loss of generality, we can assume that the player p_i chooses $v_i \in V$ for every $i \in [k]$, p_{k+1} does b, p_{k+2} does a_2, and p_{k+3} does a_3. Then, we can show that $I = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k\}$ is an independent set, as follows.

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there exists an edge $e = (v_i, v_{i'}) \in E$ for $i, i' \in [k]$. Since b_e becomes neutral at time two, neither p_i nor $p_{i'}$ dominate b_e. Moreover, p_{k+1} dominates every vertex $v \in V \backslash I'$. Thus, we have $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*) \leq n$ and $U_{i'}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) \leq n$. On the other hand, if the players p_i and $p_{i'}$ change their strategy to a_1 (or a_2), they dominate $n+1$ vertices: $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, a_1) = n+1$ and $U_{i'}(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, a_1) = n+1$, which contradict that $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is a Nash equilibrium.

2.2 Nonnegative Integer Weights

In this section, we consider graphs with nonnegative integer weights, and prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2. Competitive Diffusion *is NP-complete even for series-parallel graphs with nonnegative integer weights.*

It is easy to observe that Competitive Diffusion is contained in NP: Given the number k of players, graph G, weight w and a strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}$, we can compute $U_i(\boldsymbol{s})$ for every i, $1 \leq i \leq k$, in polynomial time just by simulating the game (k, G, w). Thus, we can verify in polynomial time whether $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is a Nash equilibrium by checking Eq. (1) for every pair of i, $1 \leq i \leq k$, and $u' \in V$.

We below prove that Competitive Diffusion is NP-hard by a reduction from Partition which asks, given a multiset $S = \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_{2n}\}$ of $2n$ positive integers, whether there exists a subset $S' \subseteq [2n]$ such that

$$\alpha = \sum_{j \in S'} s_j = \sum_{j \in [2n] \backslash S'} s_j \tag{5}$$

where $\alpha = (\sum_{j=1}^{2n} s_j)/2$. Partition is well-known to be NP-complete [6].



(a) A



(b) B

Fig. 4. Graph G_S for nonnegative integer weights. (a) Graph A. (b) Graph B.

We below construct a series-parallel graph G_S and a weight function w_S for G_S such that there exists $S' \subseteq [2n]$ satisfying Eq. (5) if and only if $(2n + 4, G_S, w_S)$ has a Nash equilibrium.

[Construction of G_S and w_S]

The graph G_S consists of two disjoint component graphs $A = (V_A, E_A)$ and $B = (V_B, E_B)$.

The graph A is a path of four vertices a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, where for every i, $1 \leq i \leq 4$, $w_S(a_1) = 2\alpha, w_S(a_2) = 1, w_S(a_3) = 1, w_S(a_4) = 2\alpha$. See Fig. 4(a).

We construct B, as follows. For every $j \in [2n]$, we make a cycle of five vertices $b_{j,1}, b_{j,2}, b_{j,3}, b_{j,4}, b_{j,5}$ placed in clockwise order. We complete B by adding two vertices b' and b'', and connecting b' to $b_{j,2}$ while connecting b'' to $b_{j,5}$ for every $j \in [2n]$. The weights of the vertices in V_B are defined as follows: $w_S(b_{j,1}) = s_j$, $w_S(b_{j,2}) = 0$, $w_S(b_{j,3}) = \alpha$, $w_S(b_{j,4}) = \alpha$, $w_S(b_{j,5}) = 0$; and $w_S(b') = w_S(b'') = \alpha$. See Fig. 4(b).

We now verify the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3. *If there exists $S' \subseteq [2n]$ satisfying Eq. (5), then $(2n + 4, G_S, w_S)$ has a Nash equilibrium.*

Proof. Let $S' \subseteq [2n]$ be a subset satisfying Eq. (5), and let $S'' = [2n] \backslash S'$. Note that $|S'| + |S''| = 2n$. Then, the following strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is shown to be a Nash equilibrium.

The strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}^*$: For each $i \in [2n]$, p_i chooses $b_{i,4}$ if $i \in S'$; and does $b_{i,3}$ if $i \in S''$. The player p_{2n+1} chooses b', p_{2n+2} does b'', p_{2n+3} does a_2, and p_{2n+4} does a_3.

We estimate the utility of each player. Consider an arbitrary player p_i, $i \in [2n]$. Since, for every $j \in [2n]$, $b_{j,2}$ and $b_{j,5}$ either become neutral or is dominated by p_{2n+1} or p_{2n+2}, we have, for every $i \in [2n]$,

$$U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = 2\alpha. \tag{6}$$

The player p_{2n+1} dominates b' together with $b_{j',1}$ and $b_{j',2}$ for every $j' \in S'$. Thus,

$$U_{2n+1}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = \alpha + \sum_{j' \in S'} s_{j'} = 2\alpha. \tag{7}$$

Similarly, p_{2n+2} dominates b'' together with $b_{j'',1}$ and $b_{j'',5}$ for every $j'' \in S''$. Thus,

$$U_{2n+2}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = \alpha + \sum_{j'' \in S''} s_{j''} = 2\alpha. \tag{8}$$

Each of p_{2n+3} and p_{2n+4} dominate the two vertices in A, and hence

$$U_{2n+3}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = U_{2n+4}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = 2\alpha + 1. \tag{9}$$

We now verify that $\boldsymbol{s}$ is a Nash equilibrium. We omit the cases where a player changes the strategy to a vertex already chosen by another player.

(i) $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_{2n}, p_{2n+3}, p_{2n+4}$

Consider an arbitrary player p_i, $i \in [2n]$. Clearly, $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, v') \leq 2\alpha$ for every $v' \in V_A$. If p_i changes the strategy to $v' \in \{b_{j,1}, b_{j,2}, b_{j,3}, b_{j,4}, b_{j,5}\}$ for some $j \in [2n] \backslash \{i\}$, then $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, v') \leq \alpha < 2\alpha$ due to p_j, p_{2n+1} and p_{2n+2}; and if p_i changes the strategy to $v' \in \{b_{i,1}, b_{i,2}, b_{i,3}, b_{i,4}, b_{i,5}\}$, then $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, v') \leq 2\alpha$ due to p_{2n+1} and p_{2n+2}, as desired.

We can similarly verify the case for p_{2n+3} and p_{2n+4}.

(ii) p_{2n+1} and p_{2n+2}

Let $i \in \{2n+1, 2n+2\}$. Smilarly to (i), $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, v') \leq 2\alpha$ for every $v' \in V_A$. If p_i changes the strategy to $v' \in \{b_{j,1}, b_{j,2}, b_{j,3}, b_{j,4}, b_{j,5}\}$ for some $j \in [2n]$, then $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, v') \leq s_j + \alpha \leq 2\alpha$, as desired.

Lemma 4. *If $(2n+4, G_S, w_S)$ has a Nash equilibrium, then there exists $S' \subseteq [2n]$ satisfying Eq. (5).*

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ be an arbitrary Nash equilibrium of $(2n+4, G_S, w_S)$. We say that a strategy profile s is *standard* if s satisfies the following conditions:

(B.1) For every $i \in [2n]$, exactly one player chooses $b_{i,3}$ or $b_{i,4}$; and no player chooses $b_{i,1}, b_{i,2}$ or $b_{i,5}$.
(B.2) Exactly one player chooses $b' \in V_B$, and exactly one player does b''.
(B.3) Exactly one player chooses $a_2 \in V_A$, and exactly one player does a_3.

We then have the following proposition whose proof will be given in the appendix.

Proposition 2. *If $(2n+4, G_S, w_S)$ has a Nash equilibrium $\boldsymbol{s}^*$, then $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is standard.*

Proposition 2 implies that $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is standard. Let S' (resp., S'') be the set of indices $i \in [2n]$ which a player chooses $b_{i,4}$ (resp., $b_{i,3}$). Let p_{2n+1} and p_{2n+2} be the players choosing b' and b'', respectively. Clearly,

$$U_{2n+1}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = \alpha + \sum_{j' \in S'} s_{j'}, \tag{10}$$

while

$$U_{2n+1}(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-(2n+1)}, a_1) = 2\alpha. \tag{11}$$

Since $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is a Nash equilibrium, Eqs. (10) and (11) imply that $2\alpha \leq \alpha + \sum_{j' \in S'} s_{j'}$, and hence

$$\alpha \leq \sum_{j' \in S'} s_{j'}. \tag{12}$$

Similarly, we have $U_{2n+2}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = \alpha + \sum_{j'' \in S'} s_{j''}$, and hence

$$\alpha \leq \sum_{j' \in S''} s_{j''}. \tag{13}$$

Since $\sum_{j' \in S'} s_{j'} + \sum_{j'' \in S''} s_{j''} = 2\alpha$, Eqs. (12) and (13) imply that S' and S'' are the desired partition.

2.3 Arbitrary Integer Weights

In this section, we prove that the problem is NP-hard even for forests.

Theorem 3. Competitive Diffusion *is NP-complete even for forests of two components.*

To prove the theorem, we employ Partition, as in the proof of Theorem 2; but we here assume that the subset S' satisfies $|S'| = n$; Partition remains NP-complete under this additional condition [6]. Moreover, We assume without loss of generality that $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_{2n}$ are even; if it is not the case, we simply double each of $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_{2n}$.



Fig. 5. Graph G_S for arbitrary integer weights. (a) Graph A. (b) Graph B.

Let $S = \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_{2n}\}$ be an input of PARTITION, and $\alpha = (\sum_{j=1}^{2n} s_j)/2$. We show that one can construct a forest G_S and a weight function w_S for G_S such that there exists $S' \subseteq [2n]$ that satisfies $|S'| = n$ and Eq. (5) if and only if $(2n+4, G_S, w_S)$ has a Nash equilibrium. The graph G_S consists of two trees $A = (V_A, E_A)$ and $B = (V_B, E_B)$.

[Construction of G_S and w_S]

The graph A is a path of four vertices a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, where for every i, $1 \leq i \leq 4$, $w_S(a_1) = \alpha, w_S(a_2) = 1, w_S(a_3) = 1, w_S(a_4) = \alpha$. See Fig. 5(a).

We then construct B, as follows. For every $j \in [2n]$, we make a graph B_j consisting of a vertex b_j together with $b_{j,1}, b_{j,2}$ and $b_{j,3}$ which compose a complete bipartite graph $K_{1,3}$. We complete B by making a path of five vertices $b'_1, b'_2, b'_3, b'_4, b'_5$, and connecting b'_4 to b_j for every $j \in [2n]$. The weights of the vertices in V_B are defined as follows: For every $j \in [2n]$, $w_S(b_j) = -\alpha + s_j, w_S(b_{j,1}) = \alpha, w_S(b_{j,2}) = \alpha, w_S(b_{j,3}) = -\alpha$; and $w_S(b'_1) = \alpha + 1, w_S(b'_2) = 0, w_S(b'_3) = -1, w_S(b'_4) = -\alpha, w_S(b'_5) = \alpha + 1$. See Fig. 5(b).

Similarly to the previous sections, we can prove that there exists $S' \subseteq [2n]$ satisfying Eq. (5) if and only if $(2n+4, G_S, w_S)$ has a Nash equilibrium. The proof is omitted, but given in the the appendix.

3 Algorithms for Forests of Paths

In the last section, we have shown that COMPETITIVE DIFFUSION is a computationally hard problem. However, we can solve the problem for some particu-

lar graph classes. In Section 3.1, we give a pseudo-polynomial-time algorithm to solve Competitive Diffusion for forests of weighted paths; as its consequence, we show that the problem is solvable in polynomial time for forest of unweighted paths. In Section 3.2, we improve the running time of our algorithm to a quadratic time for the unweighted case.

3.1 Forests of weighted paths

Let F be a forest consisting of weighted m paths $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_m$, and let W_j be the sum of the positive weights in a path P_j, $j \in [m]$. Then, we define $W = \max_{j\in[m]} W_j$ as the *upper bound on utility* for F, that is, any player can obtain at most W in F. In this subsection, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 4. *Let F be a forest of weighted paths. Let n and W be the number of vertices in F and the upper bound on utility for F, respectively. Then, we can solve* Competitive Diffusion*, and find a Nash equilibrium, if any, in $O(Wn^9)$ time.*

We note that $W = O(n)$ if F is an unweighted graph. Therefore, by Theorem 4, Competitive Diffusion is solvable in $O(n^{10})$ time for an unweighted graph F; this running time will be improved to $O(n^2)$ in Section 3.2.

Idea and definitions.

Let F be a given forest consisting of weighted m paths $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_m$. Let w be a given weight function; we sometimes denote by w_j the weight function restricted to the path P_j, $j \in [m]$. Suppose that, for an integer k, there exists a strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}$ for the game (k, F, w) that is a Nash equilibrium. Then, the strategy profile restricted to each path P_j, $j \in [m]$, forms a Nash equilibrium for (k_j, P_j, w_j), where k_j is the number of players who chose vertices in P_j. However, the other direction does not always hold: A Nash equilibrium $\boldsymbol{s}_j$ for (k_j, P_j, w_j) is not always extended to a Nash equilibrium for the whole forest F, because some player may increase its utility by moving to another path in F. To capture such a situation, we classify a Nash equilibrium for a (single) path P_j more precisely.

Consider the game (κ_j, P_j, w_j) for an integer $\kappa_j \geq 0$. For a strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}_j$ for (κ_j, P_j, w_j), we define $\mu_{P_j}(\boldsymbol{s}_j)$ as the minimum utility over all the κ_j players: $\mu_{P_j}(\boldsymbol{s}_j) = \min_{i\in[\kappa_j]} U_i(\boldsymbol{s}_j)$. In other words, any player in P_j obtains the utility at least $\mu_{P_j}(\boldsymbol{s}_j)$. For the case where $\kappa_j = 0$, we define $\boldsymbol{s}_j = \emptyset$ as the unique strategy profile for (κ_j, P_j, w_j); then, $\boldsymbol{s}_j$ is a Nash equilibrium and we define $\mu_{P_j}(\boldsymbol{s}_j) = +\infty$.

For a strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}_j = \left(s_j^{(1)}, s_j^{(2)}, \ldots, s_j^{(\kappa_j)}\right)$ for (κ_j, P_j, w_j), we then define the "potential" of the maximum utility under $\boldsymbol{s}_j$ that can be expected to gain by an extra player other than the κ_j players. More formally, for a vertex v in P_j, we denote by $\boldsymbol{s}_j + v$ the strategy profile $\left(s_j^{(1)}, s_j^{(2)}, \ldots, s_j^{(\kappa_j)}, s_j^{(\kappa_j+1)}\right)$ for $(\kappa_j + 1, P_j, w_j)$ such that $s_j^{(\kappa_j+1)} = v$. Then, we define $\nu_{P_j}(\boldsymbol{s}_j) = \max_{v\in V(P_j)} U_{\kappa_j+1}(\boldsymbol{s}_j + v)$.

For two nonnegative integers κ_j and t, we say that P_j *admits κ_j players with a boundary t* if there exists a strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}_j$ such that $\boldsymbol{s}_j$ is a Nash

equilibrium for (κ_j, P_j, w_j) and $\nu_{P_j}(\boldsymbol{s}_j) \leq t \leq \mu_{P_j}(\boldsymbol{s}_j)$ holds. Then, the following lemma characterizes a Nash equilibrium of the game (k, F, w) in terms of the components of F; the proof is given in the appendix.

Lemma 5. *The game (k, F, w) has a Nash equilibrium if and only if there exist nonnegative integers $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \ldots, \kappa_m$ and t such that $k = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \kappa_j$ and P_j admits κ_j players with the common boundary t for every $j \in [m]$.*

Algorithm.

We first focus on a weighted single path.

Lemma 6. *Let P be a weighted path of n vertices, and t be a nonnegative integer. Then, one can find in $O(n^9)$ time the set $K \subseteq \{0, 1, \ldots, 2n\}$ of all the integers κ such that P admits κ players with boundary t.*

Based on Lemma 6, we can obtain the m sets $K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_m \subseteq \{0, 1, \ldots, 2n\}$, where $K_j \subseteq \{0, 1, \ldots, 2n\}$, $j \in [m]$, is the set of all the integers κ such that P admits κ players with boundary t. This can be done in $O(n^9)$ time, where n is the number of vertices in the whole forest F.

We now claim that, for a given integer t, it can be decided in $O(n^3)$ time whether there exist nonnegative integers $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \ldots, \kappa_m$ such that $k = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \kappa_j$ and P_j admits κ_j players with the common boundary t for every $j \in [m]$; later we will apply this procedure to all possible values of t, $0 \leq t \leq W$. To show this, observe that finding desired m integers $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \ldots, \kappa_m$ from the m sets $K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_m$ can be regarded as solving an instance of the multiple-choice knapsack problem [8]: The capacity c of the knapsack is equal to k; Each integer κ' in K_j, $j \in [m]$, corresponds to an item with profit κ' and cost κ'; The items from the same set K_j form one class, from which at most one item can be packed into the knapsack. The multiple-choice knapsack problem can be solved in $O(cN)$ time [8], where N is the number of all items. Since $c = k$ and $N = O(mn)$, we can solve the corresponding instance in time $O(kmn) = O(n^3)$.

We finally apply the procedure above to all possible values of boundaries t. Since any player can obtain at most the upper bound W on utility for F, it suffices to consider $t \in [W]$. Therefore, our algorithm runs in $O(Wn^9)$ time in total.

3.2 Forests of unweighted paths

In this subsection, we improve the running time of our algorithm in Section 3.1 to a quadratic time when restricted to the unweighted case.

Theorem 5. *Let F be a forest of unweighted paths, and n be the number of vertices in F. Then, we can solve* Competitive Diffusion*, and find a Nash equilibrium, if any, in $O(n^2)$ time.*

In the rest of this subsection, we consider unweighted graphs, and thus define $w : V \to \{1\}$ for the vertex set V of a given forest. We assume that the number

k of players is less than n; otherwise, a Nash equilibrium always exists. Note that, in this case, every player has utility at least one for any Nash equilibrium.

We first show that the set K_j of Lemma 6 can be obtained in $O(1)$ time, instead of $O(n^9)$ time, by characterizing Nash equilibriums for (κ, P, w) in terms of κ, t and n.

Lemma 7. *Let P be a single unweighted path of n vertices, and let κ and t be nonnegative and positive integers, respectively.*

(1) *P admits $\kappa = 0$ player with t if and only if $n \leq t$.*
(2) *P admits $\kappa = 1$ player with t if and only if $t \leq n \leq 2t + 1$.*
(3) *P admits $\kappa = 2$ players with t if and only if $2t \leq n \leq 2t + 2$.*
(4) *P admits $\kappa = 3$ players with t if and only if $t = 1$ and $n = 3, 4$ or 5.*
(5) *For any integer $\kappa \geq 4$, P admits κ players with t if and only if*

$$\begin{array}{ll} (\kappa+1)t - 1 \leq n \leq (2\kappa-4)t + \kappa & \text{if } \kappa \text{ is odd;} \\ \kappa t \leq n \leq (2\kappa-4)t + \kappa & \text{if } \kappa \text{ is even.} \end{array} \tag{14}$$

By Lemme 7, we can immediately obtain the number of players which P admits with a given boundary t:

Corollary 1. *Consider a fixed boundary t. If P is a path of n vertices, the numbers of players which P admits with a boundary t is given as follows.*

(1) *If $n \leq t - 1$, the number is only 0.*
(2) *If $n = t$, the numbers are 0 and 1.*
(3) *If $t + 1 \leq n \leq 2t - 1$, the number is only 1.*
(4) *If $2t \leq n \leq 2t + 1$ and $n = 3$, the numbers are $1, 2$ and 3; and if $2t \leq n \leq 2t + 1$ and $n \neq 3$, the numbers are 1 and 2.*
(5) *If $n = 2t + 2$ and $n = 4$, the numbers are $2, 3$ and 4; and if $n = 2t + 2$ and $n \neq 4$, the number is only 2.*
(6) *If $2t + 3 \leq n \leq 4t - 1$, P has no desired Nash equilibrium.*
(7) *If $4t \leq n$ and $5 \leq n$, the numbers are integers κ such that*

$$\left\lceil \frac{n+4t}{2t+1} \right\rceil \leq \kappa \leq \max(k_{odd}, k_{even}),$$

where k_{odd} is the maximum odd integer satisfying $k_{odd} \leq (n - t + 1)/t$, and k_{even} is the maximum even integer satisfying $k_{even} \leq n/t$.

We use Corollary 1 to design our algorithm for forests of paths.

Without loss of generality, we assume that P_1 is a longest path among the m paths, and has n_1 vertices. For each t, $1 \leq t \leq n_1$, we repeat the following procedure: For every j, $1 \leq j \leq m$, we obtain, using Corollary 1, the minimum number $k_j^{\min}$ and the maximum number $k_j^{\max}$ of players which P_j admits with the boundary t. Corollary 1 implies that, for every j, $1 \leq j \leq m$, P_j admits κ players with t for any κ between $k_j^{\min}$ and $k_j^{\max}$, and hence (k, F, w) has a Nash equilibrium with the common boundary t if and only if

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} k_j^{\min} \leq k \leq \sum_{j=1}^{m} k_j^{\max}. \tag{15}$$

We thus complete the procedure by checking if the two inequalities in (15) both hold. Since Corollary 1 implies that we can obtain $k_j^{\min}$ and $k_j^{\max}$ in constant time for every j, the running time of the procedure above for single t is $O(m)$, and hence that of our entire algorithm is $O(n_1 m) = O(n^2)$, as desired.

4 Algorithms for Chain, Cochain, and Threshold Graphs

A bipartite graph $B = (X, Y; E)$ with $|X| = p$ and $|Y| = q$ is a *chain graph* if there is an ordering $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_p)$ on X such that $N(x_1) \subseteq N(x_2) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq N(x_p)$, where $N(u)$ denote a set of neighbors of a vertex u. If there is such an ordering on X, then there also exists an ordering $(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_q)$ on Y such that $N(y_1) \subseteq N(y_2) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq N(y_q)$. We call such orderings *inclusion orderings*. A graph B' is a *cochain graph* if it can be obtained from a chain graph $B = (X, Y; E)$ by making the independents sets X and Y into cliques. A graph B'' is a *threshold graph* if it can be obtained from a chain graph $B = (X, Y; E)$ by making one of the independents sets X and Y into a clique. Observe that inclusion orderings on X and Y in B can be seen as *inclusion orderings* in B' and B'' if we use closed neighborhoods in cliques. Such inclusion orderings can be found in linear time [7]. Because the algorithm for chain graphs we will describe in this section depends only on its property of having inclusion orderings, we can apply the exactly same algorithm for cochain graphs and threshold graphs.

The following lemma follows directly from the definitions. Note that $N[u] = N(u) \cup \{u\}$.

Lemma 8. *If $N(u) \subseteq N(v)$ or $N[u] \subseteq N[v]$ holds for $u = s^{(i)} \neq v = s^{(j)}$, then*

$$U_i(\boldsymbol{s}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if there is } h \neq i \text{ such that } s^{(h)} = u, \\ w(u) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In what follows, let $B = (X, Y; E)$ be a chain graph with inclusion orderings $(x_1, \ldots, x_p)$ and $(y_1, \ldots, y_q)$ on X and Y, respectively. We define $\eta(\boldsymbol{s}, X) = \max(\{0\} \cup \{i \mid x_i \in V(\boldsymbol{s})\})$ and $\eta(\boldsymbol{s}, Y) = \max(\{0\} \cup \{i \mid y_i \in V(\boldsymbol{s})\})$.

Lemma 9. *Let $\boldsymbol{s}$ be a Nash equilibrium of B. If $s^{(i)} \notin \{x_{\eta(\boldsymbol{s},X)}, y_{\eta(\boldsymbol{s},Y)}\}$, then*

$$w(s^{(i)}) \geq \max\left\{w(u) \mid u \in \left(\{x_j \mid j \leq \eta(\boldsymbol{s}, X)\} \cup \{y_j \mid j \leq \eta(\boldsymbol{s}, Y)\}\right) \setminus V(\boldsymbol{s})\right\} \quad (16)$$

Proof. Since $N(s^{(i)}) \subseteq N(x_{\eta(\boldsymbol{s},X)})$ or $N(s^{(i)}) \subseteq N(y_{\eta(\boldsymbol{s},Y)})$, it follows that $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}) \leq w(s^{(i)})$ by Lemma 8. Suppose for the contrary that there exists $u \in (\{x_j \mid j \leq \eta(\boldsymbol{s}, X)\} \cup \{y_j \mid j \leq \eta(\boldsymbol{s}, Y)\}) \setminus V(\boldsymbol{s})$ such that $w(s^{(i)}) < w(u)$. Now it holds that $N(u) \subseteq N(x_{\eta(\boldsymbol{s},X)})$ or $N(u) \subseteq N(y_{\eta(\boldsymbol{s},Y)})$. Thus, by Lemma 8, we have $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}_{-i}, u) = w(u) > w(s^{(i)}) \geq U_i(\boldsymbol{s})$. This contradicts the assumption that $\boldsymbol{s}$ is a Nash equilibrium.

Thus, it suffices to check the strategy profiles satisfying Eq. (16) for our purpose.

Algorithm 1 Find a Nash equilibrium $\boldsymbol{s} \in V^k$ of a chain graph $B = (X, Y; E)$

Let $(x_1, \ldots, x_p)$ on X and $(y_1, \ldots, y_q)$ on Y be inclusion orderings.
// The following is for the case where $\eta(\boldsymbol{s}, X) \neq 0$.
for all guesses $(\eta(\boldsymbol{s}, X), \eta(\boldsymbol{s}, Y)) \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \times \{0, \ldots, q\}$ **do**
  $s^{(1)} := x_{\eta(\boldsymbol{s},X)}$. $s^{(2)} := y_{\eta(\boldsymbol{s},Y)}$ **if** $\eta(\boldsymbol{s}, Y) \neq 0$.
  $R := \{x_i \mid i < \eta(\boldsymbol{s}, X)\} \cup \{y_i \mid i < \eta(\boldsymbol{s}, Y)\}$.
  while there is a player i not assigned to a vertex **do**
    $v := \arg\max_{u \in R} w(u)$.
    if $w(v) \geq 0$ **then**
      $s^{(i)} := v$. $R := R \setminus \{v\}$.
    else
      $s^{(i)} := x_{\eta(\boldsymbol{s},X)}$.
    end if
  end while
  return $\boldsymbol{s}$ **if** it is a Nash equilibrium.
end for
return "no Nash equilibrium"

Theorem 6. *Let G be a chain, cochain, or threshold graph of n vertices and m edges. Then, we can solve* Competitive Diffusion *for G, and find a Nash equilibrium, if any, in $O(n^4(m+n))$ time.*

Proof. We present an algorithm for chain graphs only. As previously described, we can apply the same algorithm for cochain and threshold graph.

We first guess $\eta(\boldsymbol{s}, X)$ and $\eta(\boldsymbol{s}, Y)$. Here we assume $\eta(\boldsymbol{s}, X) \neq 0$. The other case can be treated in the same way by swapping X and Y. We assign $x_{\eta(\boldsymbol{s},X)}$ to the first player. If $\eta(\boldsymbol{s}, Y) \neq 0$, then we assign $y_{\eta(\boldsymbol{s},Y)}$ to the second player. By Lemma 9, if $\boldsymbol{s}$ is a Nash equilibrium, then the other players have to select the heaviest vertices in $\{x_i \mid i < \eta(\boldsymbol{s}, X)\} \cup \{y_i \mid i < \eta(\boldsymbol{s}, Y)\}$. For each of the remaining players, we assign a vacant vertex with the maximum non-negative weight. If there is no such a vertex, we assign $x_{\eta(\boldsymbol{s},X)}$. We then test whether the strategy profile is a Nash equilibrium. See Algorithm 1.

Lemma 9 implies that if the algorithm assigns at most one player to $x_{\eta(\boldsymbol{s},X)}$, then the algorithm is correct. If two or more players are assigned to $x_{\eta(\boldsymbol{s},X)}$, then these players have utility 0. In such a case, there are not enough number of vertices of non-negative weights in $\{x_i \mid i < \eta(\boldsymbol{s}, X)\} \cup \{y_i \mid i < \eta(\boldsymbol{s}, Y)\}$. Thus every $\boldsymbol{s}$ with the guesses $\eta(\boldsymbol{s}, X)$ and $\eta(\boldsymbol{s}, Y)$ has a player with non-positive utility. If such a player, say p_i, has negative utility, then $\boldsymbol{s}$ is clearly not a Nash equilibrium. If p_i has utility 0, then it may improve its utility only if there is a vertex $v \in \{x_{\eta(\boldsymbol{s},X)+1}, \ldots, x_p\} \cup \{y_{\eta(\boldsymbol{s},Y)+1}, \ldots, y_q\}$ such that $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}_{-i}, v) > 0$. However, in this case, there is no Nash equilibrium with the guesses $\eta(\boldsymbol{s}, X)$ and $\eta(\boldsymbol{s}, Y)$. Therefore, the algorithm is correct.

We now analyze the running time of the algorithm. We have $O(n^2)$ options for guessing $x_{\eta(\boldsymbol{s},X)}$ and $y_{\eta(\boldsymbol{s},Y)}$. For each guess, the bottle-neck of the running time is to test whether the strategy profile is a Nash equilibrium or not. It

takes $O(n^2(m+n))$ time as follows: we have $O(n^2)$ candidates of moves of players; for each candidate, we can compute the utility of the player moved by running a breadth-first search once in $O(m+n)$ time by adding a virtual root connecting to all the vertices occupied by the players. In total, the algorithm runs in $O(n^4(m+n))$ time.

References

1. N. Alon, M. Feldman, A. D. Procaccia, and M. Tennenholtz. A note on competitive diffusion through social networks. *Information Processing Letters*, 110(6):221–225, 2010.
2. C. Dürr and N. K. Thang. Nash equilibria in Voronoi games on graphs. ESA '07, pp. 17–28, 2007.
3. S. R. Etesami and T. Basar Complexity of Equilibrium in Diffusion Games on Social Networks. *arXiv:1403.3881*, 2014.
4. R. Feldmann, M. Mavronicolas and B. Monien. Nash equilibria for Voronoi games on transitive graphs. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Workshop on Internet and Network Economics*, WINE '09, pp. 280–291, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009. Springer-Verlag.
5. J. Flum and M. Grohe. *Parameterized Complexity Theory.* Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series, 2006.
6. M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness.* W. H. Freeman, 1979.
7. P. Heggernes and D. Kratsch. Linear-time certifying recognition algorithms and forbidden induced subgraphs. *Nordic Journal of Computing*, Vol. 14, 87–108, 2008.
8. H. Kellerer, U. Pferschy and D. Pisinger. Knapsack Problems. Springer-Verlag, 2004.
9. M. Mavronicolas, B. Monien, V. G. Papadopoulou, and F. Schoppmann. Voronoi games on cycle graphs. In *Proceedings of the 33rd international symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science*, MFCS '08, pp. 503–514, 2008.
10. L. Small and O. Mason. Nash Equilibria for competitive information diffusion on trees. *Information Processing Letters*, 113(7):217–219, 2013.
11. R. Takehara, M. Hachimori and M. Shigeno. A comment on pure-strategy Nash equilibria in competitive diffusion games. *Information Processing Letters*, 112(3):59–60, 2012.
12. R. Takehara and M. Shigeno. Statement in *Kyoto University Research Information Repository*, 1773:132–141, 2012 (*in Japanese*).
13. S. Teramoto, E. D. Demaine, and R. Uehara. The Voronoi game on graphs and its complexity. *Journal of Graph Algorithms and Applications*, 15(4):485–501, 2011.

A Proof of Proposition 1

Our proof of Proposition 1 consists of a sequence of claims, and we prove each claim by contradiction: we suppose that a claim does not hold, and show that it contradicts the fact that $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is a Nash equilibrium.

Let $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ be an arbitrary Nash equilibrium of $(k+3, G', w')$. We start by the following claim.

Claim 1. There are at most two players choosing vertices in V_A.

Proof. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there are $k'(\geq 3)$ players choosing vertices in V_A. Then there exists a players p_i dominating at most one vertex: $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*) \leq 1$. On the other hand, every $v \in V$ has $n - \delta_v (\geq 1)$ neighbors for every $v \in V$, and b has $\lambda + n (\geq 1)$ neighbors, and thus there are $n+1$ vertices (i.e., ones in V and b) by which p_i can dominate at least two vertices by changing the strategy. Since we have $k' \geq 3$, there are at most $k (\leq n)$ players choosing vertices in V_B, and hence we have a contradiction.

Then, we prove the following claim.

Claim 2. $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ satisfies A.2.

Proof. Suppose $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ does not satisfy A.2, that is, no player chooses b. Since Claim 1 implies that at least $k+3-2 \geq 2$ players choose vertices in V_B, there exists a player p_i who cannot dominate b. Since $b_1, b_2, \cdots, b_\lambda$ are connected only to b, p_i dominates either at most one of $b_1, b_2, \cdots, b_\lambda$ or at most all the other vertices in V_B. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} U_i(\boldsymbol{s}) &\leq n + m + \sum_{v \in V} |D_v| \\ &\leq n + m + n^2 - 2m \\ &\leq n^2 + n - m. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, p_i can dominate, by changing the strategy to b, at least b together with some of $b_1, b_2, \cdots, b_\lambda$ and the vertices in V. In this case, since each of the other $k+2 \leq n+2$ players can dominate at most two vertices of $b_1, b_2, \cdots, b_\lambda$ and the vertices in V due to p_i, we have

$$U_i(\boldsymbol{s}_{-i}, b) \geq \lambda - 2(n+2) = \Theta(n^3).$$

We complete the proof of Lemma 1 by verifying the following two claims.

Claim 3. $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ satisfies A.3.

Proof. By Claim 1, it suffices to consider the case where there are at most two players choosing vertices in V_A.

Consider the case where exactly two players choose vertices in V_A other than "a_2 and a_3." Without loss of generality, the chosen vertices are "a_1 and a_2," "a_1

and a_3," "a_1 and a_4," or one of the players chooses a'_1. For any of them, one player can increase the utility by choosing a_2 or a_3.

Consider the other case where at most one player chooses a vertex in V_A. Then, there are at least $k+2$ players choosing vertices in V_B. Since Claim 2 implies that some player chooses b, each of the other players dominates at most $n+1$ vertices; let p_i be one of them: $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*) \leq n+1$. On the other hand, we have either

$$U_i(\boldsymbol{s}_{-i}, a_2) \geq n+2 \quad \text{or} \quad U_i(\boldsymbol{s}_{-i}, a_3) \geq n+2.$$

Claim 4. $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ satisfies A.1.

Proof. Suppose there exists a player p_i choosing either $u \in D_v$ for some $v \in V$, b_e for some $e \in E$, or one of $b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_\lambda$. Claim 2 implies that p_i dominates only one vertex: $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*) \leq 1$. However, Claim 3 implies that

$$U_i(\boldsymbol{s}, a_1) \geq n+1.$$

B Proof of Proposition 2

In this section, we prove Proposition 2. As in the last section, our proof consists of a sequence of claims.

Consider an arbitrary Nash equilibrium $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ of $(2n+4, G_S, w_S)$. We first verify the following claim:

Claim 5. $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ satisfies (B.3).

Proof. Suppose $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ does not satisfy (B.3). We consider the following three cases (i), (ii) and (iii).

(i) *More than three players choose vertices in A.*

Suppose there are at least three players choosing vertices in V_A, which implies that there exists a player p whose utility is at most one. Moreover, at most $2n+1$ players choose vertices in V_B, and there are $4n+2$ vertices with weight α. Thus, the player p obtain the utility $\alpha(>1)$ by changing the strategy to a vertex in V_B, which contradicts the fact that $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is a Nash equilibrium.

(ii) *Exactly two players choose vertices in A.*

Since $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ does not satisfy (B.3), we can assume without loss of generality that the two players choose either "a_1 and a_2," "a_1 and a_3" or " a_1 and a_4." For both cases, a player can increase the utility by choosing a_2 or a_3.

(iii) *At most one player chooses a vertex in A.*

In this case, there exists a vertex in V_A such that any player obtain utility $2\alpha+1$ by changing the strategy to it. Thus, it suffices to show that one of the other $2n+3$ (or $2n+4$) players has utility at most 2α. Clearly, the players, in this case, choose vertices in V_B, while the sum of the weights of all the vertices in V_B is

$$\sum_{j \in [2n]} (2\alpha + s_j) + \alpha + \alpha = 4n\alpha + 4\alpha = 2\alpha(2n+2).$$

Thus, at least one player has utility less than 2α, as desired.

We now consider the other $2n+2$ players choosing vertices in V_B. For every j, $j \in [2n]$, we define P_j as a set of indices of the players who choose $b_{j,1}, b_{j,2}, b_{j,3}, b_{j,4}$ or $b_{j,5}$ on $\boldsymbol{s}^*$. We then have the following claim.

Claim 6. For every $j \in [2n]$, $|P_j| \leq 1$.

Proof. Note that, by Claim 5, any player can obtain the utility 2α by changing the strategy to a_1. Furthermore, the sum of all the weights of the vertices in V_B is exactly $2\alpha(2n+2)$. Thus, to derive a contradiction, it suffices to show that some vertex with a positive weight becomes neutral or there exists a player whose utility is less than (or more than) 2α.

If there exists j such that $|P_j| \geq 4$, then we can verify by exhaustive search that there must exist a player p_i, $i \in P_j$, has the utility less than 2α.

If there exists j such that $|P_j| = 3$, we can assume that the three players choose either $b_{j,1}, b_{j,2}$ and $b_{j,3}$ or $b_{j,1}, b_{j,4}$ and $b_{j,5}$; otherwise, a player p_i, $i \in P_j$, must have the utility less than 2α or one of $b_{j,1}, b_{j,3}$ and $b_{j,4}$ becomes neutral. Without loss of generality, we consider the former case. Then, the player choosing $b_{j,1}$ dominates $b_{j,1}$ and $b_{j,5}$, and also may dominate b''; but, cannot do any of the other vertices with positive weights due to the player dominating b' or the one choosing $b_{j,2}$. Thus, the player choosing $b_{j,1}$ has the utility at most $s_j + \alpha < 2\alpha$.

Suppose there exists j such that $|P_j| = 2$; let p and p' be the two players. We consider the following two cases.

(i) *Two players choose b' and b''.*

In this case, p and p' can dominate vertices only of $b_{j,1}, b_{j,2}, b_{j,3}, b_{j,4}$ and $b_{j,5}$, the sum of whose weights is $2\alpha + s_j < 4\alpha$. Thus, one of p and p' has the utility less than 2α.

(ii) *Exactly one player chooses b' or b''.*

Suppose without loss of generality that a player chooses b', but no player does b''. Then, the two players must choose either "$b_{j,1}$ and $b_{j,3}$" or "$b_{j,4}$ and $b_{j,5}$." However, the player choosing $b_{j,1}$ (or $b_{j,5}$) dominates $b_{j,1}$ and $b_{j,5}$, and also may dominate b''; but cannot do any of the other vertices with positive weights due to the player choosing b'. Thus, the utility of the player choosing $b_{j,1}$ (or $b_{j,5}$) is $s_j + \alpha < 2\alpha$.

(iii) *No player chooses b' or b''.*

In this case, it suffices to consider the case where the two players choose either "$b_{j,1}$ and $b_{j,3}$," "$b_{j,1}$ and $b_{j,4}$," "$b_{j,2}$ and $b_{j,3}$" or "$b_{j,4}$ and $b_{j,5}$," since, otherwise, a vertex with a positive integer weight becomes neutral.

We verify only the case for "$b_{j,1}$ and $b_{j,3}$," since the other three cases are similar. In this case, a player p_i choosing $b_{j,1}$ dominates $b_{j,1}$ and $b_{j,5}$. Furthermore, if p_i does not dominate b'', then the utility is $s_j < 2\alpha$. Otherwise, that is, if p_i dominates b'', then p_i faced on one of the following two situations for any $j' \in [2n] \backslash \{j\}$: (iii-1) if there exists a player choosing one of $b_{j',1}, b_{j',2}, b_{j',3}, b_{j',4}$ and $b_{j',5}$, then p_i cannot dominate none of them; and (iii-2) if no player chooses $b_{j',1}, b_{j',2}, b_{j',3}, b_{j',4}$ and $b_{j',5}$, then either p_i dominates none of them or p_i does at least $b_{j',4}$. Therefore, p_i cannot have the utility exactly 2α.

We thus complete the proof of the claim.

Claim 7. $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ satisfies (B.1) and (B.2).

Proof. Claims 5 and 6 immediately imply that exactly two players must choose b' and b'', and hence $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ satisfies (B.2). Therefore, we have $|P_j| = 1$ for every $j \in [2n]$; otherwise, a vertex with weight s_j such that $|P_j| = 0$ becomes neutral. Consequently, $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ satisfies (B.1): otherwise a vertex with a positive weight becomes neutral, or the game end while such vertex is not dominated by any player

C Proof of Theorem 3

In this section, we prove Theorem 3: we show that there exists $S' \subseteq [2n]$ satisfying Eq. (5) if and only if $(2n+4, G_S, w_S)$ has a Nash equilibrium. We say that a player p *rules* B_j, $j \in [2n]$, if p dominates all the four vertices $b_j, b_{j,1}, b_{j,2}$ and $b_{j,3}$ in B_j.

C.1 Main Proof

We first prove the sufficiency of the theorem.

Lemma 10. *If there exists $S' \subseteq [2n]$ that satisfies $|S'| = n$ and Eq. (5), then $(2n+4, G_S, w_S)$ has a Nash equilibrium.*

Proof. Let $S' \subseteq [2n]$ be a subset satisfying Eq. (5). We denote by $j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_n \in [2n]$ the indices of the integers in S', that is, $S = \{s_{j_1}, s_{j_2}, \ldots, s_{j_n}\}$. Then, the following strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is shown to be a Nash equilibrium.

The strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}^*$: For each $i \in [n]$, the players p_{2i-1} and p_{2i} choose $b_{j_i,1}$ and $b_{j_i,2}$, respectively. The player p_{2n+1} chooses b'_1, p_{2n+2} does b'_5, p_{2n+3} does a_2, and p_{2n+4} does a_3, respectively.

We estimate the utility of each player. Consider the players p_{2i-1} and p_{2i} for every $i \in [n]$. Since b_i becomes neutral, p_{2i-1} dominates only $b_{i,1}$, and p_{2i} does only $b_{i,2}$. Thus, for every $i \in [n]$,

$$U_{2i-1}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = U_{2i}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = \alpha. \tag{17}$$

The player p_{2n+1} dominates only b'_1 and b'_2. Thus,

$$U_{2n+1}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = \alpha + 1. \tag{18}$$

The player p_{2n+2} dominates b'_4 and b'_5; besides, p_{2n+2} rules B_j for every $j \in [2n] \backslash S'$. Thus, Eq. (5) implies that

$$U_{2n+1}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = -\alpha + \alpha + 1 + \sum_{j \in [2n] \backslash S'} s_j = \alpha + 1. \tag{19}$$

The players p_{2n+3} and p_{2n+4} dominate two vertices in A, and hence

$$U_{2n+3}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = U_{2n+4}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = \alpha + 1. \tag{20}$$

Below we show that $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is a Nash equilibrium by verifying Eq. (1). We omit the cases where a player changes the strategy to a vertex chosen by another player.

(i) $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_{2n}, p_{2n+3}, p_{2n+4}$

Consider an arbitrary player p_i, $i \in [2n] \cup \{2n+3, 2n+4\}$. By Eq. (17) and (20), it suffices to show that $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, v') \leq \alpha$ for any $v' \in V_A \cup V_B$. If $v' \in V_A$, then $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, v') \leq \alpha$. If $v' \in \{b'_2, b'_3\}$, then $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, v') = -1$. If $v' = b'_4$, then p_i dominates b'_3 and b'_4, and also rules B_j for every $j \in [2n] \backslash S'$. Thus

$$U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, v') = -1 - \alpha + \sum_{j \in [2n] \backslash S'} s_j$$

and hence Eq. (5) implies that

$$U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, v') = -1 - \alpha + \alpha = -1.$$

Consider $v' \in B_j$ for some $j \in [2n]$. If $j \in S'$, p_i dominates either only $b_{j,3}$ or b_j together with $b_{j,3}$. Otherwise, since p_{2n+2} chooses b'_5, p_i just rules B_j. Thus, $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, v') \leq s_j \leq \alpha$.

(ii) p_{2n+1}

By Eq. (18), it suffices to show that $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, v') \leq \alpha + 1$ for any $v' \in V_A \cup V_B$. Similarly to the case (i), $U_{2n+1}(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-(2n+1)}, v') = \alpha$ if p_{2n+1} chooses a vertex in V_A or B_j for some $j \in [2n]$. If $v' \in \{b'_2, b'_3\}$, then p_{2n+1} dominates b'_1, b'_2, b'_3, and hence $U_{2n+1}(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-(2n+1)}, v') = \alpha$. If $v' = b'_4$, then p_{2n+1} dominates b'_1, b'_2, b'_3, b'_4, and also rules B_j for every $j \in [2n] \backslash S'$. Thus, by Eq. (5),

$$\begin{aligned} U_{2n+1}(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-(2n+1)}, v') &= (\alpha + 1) - 1 - \alpha + \sum_{j \in [2n] \backslash S'} s_j \\ &= \alpha + 1 - 1 - \alpha + \alpha \\ &= \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

(iii) p_{2n+2}

By Eq. (19), it suffices to show that $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, v') \leq \alpha + 1$ for any $v' \in V'$. Similarly to the case (i), if $v' \in V_A$, $U_{2n+1}(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-(2n+1)}, v') = \alpha$. If $v' \in B_j$ for some $j \in S'$, p_{2n+2} dominates exactly the same set of the vertices as the one for $\boldsymbol{s}^*$, that is, p_{2n+2} dominates b'_4, b'_5, and rules B_j for every $j \in [2n] \backslash S'$. Thus,

$$U_{2n+1}(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-(2n+1)}, v') = -\alpha + (\alpha + 1) + \sum_{j \in S'} s_j = \alpha + 1,$$

since b_j becomes neutral for every $j \in S'$. If $v' \in \{b'_2, b'_3, b_4\}$, then p_{2n+2} dominates b'_3, b'_4, b'_5, and rules B_j for every $j \in [2n] \backslash S'$. Thus,

$$U_{2n+1}(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-(2n+1)}, v') = -1 - \alpha + (\alpha + 1) + \sum_{j \in S'} s_j = \alpha.$$

.

We below prove the necessity of the theorem.

Lemma 11. *If $(2n+4, G_S, w_S)$ has a Nash equilibrium, there exists $S' \subseteq [2n]$ that satisfies $|S'| = n$ and Eq. (5).*

Proof. We show that if $(2n+4, G_S, w_S)$ has a Nash equilibrium, then the exists $S' \subseteq [2n]$ satisfying Eq. (5). We say that a strategy profile s is *standard* if s satisfies the following conditions:

(C.1) There exists a set $S' \subseteq [2n]$ such that $|S'| = n$ and, for every $j \in S'$, a player chooses $b_{j,1}$, a player does $b_{j,2}$, and no player choose b_j and $b_{j,3}$. Moreover, for every $j \in [2n]\backslash S'$, no player chooses a vertex in B_j.
(C.2) A player chooses b'_1, and a player does b'_5.
(C.3) A player chooses a_2, and a player does a_3.

We then have the following lemma whose proof will be given in the next section.

Proposition 3. *If $(2n+4, G_S, w_S)$ has a Nash equilibrium $\boldsymbol{s}^*$, then $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is standard.*

Let $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ be an arbitrary Nash equilibrium of $(2n+4, G_S, w_S)$; Proposition 3 implies that $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is standard. Let $S' = \{j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_n\} \subseteq [2n]$. We can assume without loss of generality that, for each $i \in [n]$, the players p_{2i-1} and p_{2i} choose $b_{j_i,1}$ and $b_{j_i,2}$, respectively; p_{2n+1} chooses b'_1, p_{2n+2} does b'_5, p_{2n+3} does a_2, and p_{2n+4} does a_3.

Since p_{2n+1} dominates only b'_1 and b'_2,

$$U_{2n+1}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = \alpha + 1. \tag{21}$$

Besides, if p_{2n+1} changes the strategy to b'_4, p_{2n+1} dominates b'_1, b'_2, b'_3, b'_4, and rules B_j for every $j \in [2n]\backslash S'$:

$$\begin{aligned} U_{2n+1}(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-(2n+1)}, b'_4) &= (\alpha+1) + (-1) + \alpha + \sum_{j \in [2n]\backslash S'} s_j \\ &= \sum_{j \in [2n]\backslash S'} s_j. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Since $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is a Nash equilibrium, Eqs. (21) and (22) imply that

$$\sum_{j \in [2n]\backslash S'} s_j \leq \alpha + 1. \tag{23}$$

On the other hand, p_{2n+2} dominates b'_4, b'_5, and rules B_j for every $j \in [2n]\backslash S'$:

$$\begin{aligned} U_{2n+2}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) &= (\alpha+1) + (-\alpha) + \sum_{j \in [2n]\backslash S'} s_j \\ &= 1 + \sum_{j \in [2n]\backslash S'} s_j. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Besides, if p_{2n+2} changes the strategy to a_1, p_{2n+2} dominates only a_1:

$$U_{2n+2}(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-(2n+2)}, b'_4) = \alpha. \tag{25}$$

Therefore, Eqs. (24) and (25) imply that

$$\alpha \leq 1 + \sum_{j \in [2n] \setminus S'} s_j. \tag{26}$$

By Eqs. (23) and (26),

$$\alpha - 1 \leq \sum_{j \in [2n] \setminus S'} s_j \leq \alpha + 1.$$

Since s_j is even for every $j \in [2n]$, we have

$$\sum_{j \in [2n] \setminus S'} s_j = \alpha,$$

and hence S' is the desired partition.

C.2 Proof of Proposition 3

Consider an arbitrary Nash equilibrium $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ of $(2n+4, G_S, w_S)$. For every $j \in [2n]$, we define β_j as the number of players who choose vertices in B_j on $\boldsymbol{s}^*$.

Firstly, we prove the following claim.

Claim 8. $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ satisfies (C.3).

Proof. Suppose $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ does not satisfy (C.3). We derive a contradiction for each of (i), (ii) and (iii) below.

(i) *More than three players choose vertices in A.*

In this case, there exists a player p_i such that $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*) \leq 1$, and at most $2n+1$ players choose vertices in V_B.

If there exists $j \in [2n]$ such that $\beta_j = 0$, p_i can rule B_j by changing the strategy to b_j. Moreover, if p_i also dominates b'_4, p_i does b'_5; and if p_i also dominates $b_{j'}$ for some $j' \in [2n]$, p_i rules $B_{j'}$. Therefore, since s_j is even,

$$U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, b_j) \geq s_j \geq 2.$$

Otherwise, that is, if $\beta_j \geq 1$ for every $j \in [2n]$, then there exists $j' \in [2n]$ such that $\beta_{j'} = 1$. Thus, p_i can dominate only either $b_{j',1}$ or $b_{j',2}$, and hence, for some $v' \in \{b_{j',1}, b_{j',2}\}$,

$$U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, v') \geq \alpha \geq 2.$$

(ii) *exactly two players choose vertices in A.*

Since $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ does not satisfy (C.3), we can assume without loss of generality that the two players choose either "a_1 and a_2," "a_1 and a_3" or " a_1 and a_4." For both cases, a player can increase the utility by choosing a_2 or a_3.

(iii) *at most one player chooses a vertex in A.*

In this case, there exists a vertex in V_A such that any player obtains utility $\alpha+1$ by changing the strategy to the vertex. Thus, it suffices to show that some player has utility at most α. Note that at least $2n+3$ players choose vertices in V_B in this case.

If there exists $j \in [2n]$ such that $\beta_j \geq 2$, then one of the players has utility at most α, as desired. If there exists a pair of $j, j' \in [2n]$ such that $\beta_j = \beta_{j'} = 1$, one of the players (say, the one who choose a vertex in B_j) cannot dominate b'_4, and hence its utility is less than or equals to α, as desired. Otherwise, that is, if either $\beta_j = 0$ for every $j \in [2n]$ or there exists an unique $j \in [2n]$ such that $\beta_j = 1$, then the other players choose $b'_1, b'_2, b'_3, b'_4, b'_5$, and hence some player has utility at most zero.

We below consider the other $2n+2$ players who choose vertices in V_B.

Claim 9. For every $j \in [2n]$, $\beta_j \leq 2$; and there exists at most one $j \in [2n]$ such that $\beta_j = 1$.

Proof. We first prove that $\beta_j \leq 2$ for every $j \in [2n]$. Note that, by Claim 8, any player can obtain the utility α by changing the strategy to a_1.

Suppose there exists j, $j \in [2n]$, such that $\beta_j \geq 4$. Then, the utility of one of the players is at most $0 < \alpha$, as desired.

Suppose there exists $j \in [2n]$ such that $\beta_j = 3$. If the three players do not choose $b_j, b_{j,1}$ and $b_{j,2}$, then one of the players has the utility of at most $0 < \alpha$; thus, let $p_i, p_{i'}$ and $p_{i''}$ be the players choosing $b_j, b_{j,1}$ and $b_{j,2}$, respectively. If some player other than $p_i, p_{i'}$ and $p_{i''}$ chooses b'_4 or b'_5, the player p_i dominates only b_j and $b_{j,3}$, and hence $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = -2\alpha + s_j < \alpha$. If no player chooses b'_4 or b'_5, then we have $U_{i'}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = \alpha$, while $U_{i'}(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i'}, b'_5) = \alpha + 1$.

We then prove that there exists at most one $j \in [2n]$ such that $\beta_j = 1$. Suppose there exist $j', j'' \in [2n]$ such that $\beta_{j'} = \beta_{j''} = 1$. Let $p_{i'}$ and $p_{i''}$ be the players choosing vertices in $B_{j'}$ and $B_{j''}$, respectively. We consider the following two cases.

(i) There exists a player p_i choosing b'_4.

In this case, we have $U_{i'}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) \leq \alpha$, while $p_{i'}$ can increase the utility as follows: If no player chooses b'_1, $U_{i'}(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i'}, b'_1) = \alpha + 1$; similarly, if no player chooses b'_5, $U_{i'}(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{i'}, b'_5) = \alpha + 1$. If there are a player choosing b'_1 and one choosing b'_5,

$$\begin{aligned} U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*) &\leq -\alpha + \sum_{j \in [2n] \setminus \{j', j''\}} s_j \\ &\leq -\alpha + 2\alpha - s_{j'} - s_{j''} \\ &< \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) No player chooses b'_4.

In this case, one of $p_{i'}$ and $p_{i''}$ does not dominate b'_4; let $p_{i'}$ be such a player. Then, $p_{i'}$ rules $B_{j'}$, but does not dominate other verticies. Thus, $U_{i'}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = s_{j'} < \alpha$.

Claim 9 implies that $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ satisfies (C.1), as follows.

Claim 10. $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ satisfies (C.1).

Proof. Let $\mathcal{B} = \{j \in [2n] \mid \beta_j = 2\}$. We first verify that $|\mathcal{B}| = n$, and then show that the two players in B_j for each $j \in \mathcal{B}$ choose $b_{j,1}$ and $b_{j,2}$. Recall that, by Claim 8, any player can obtain the utility α by changing the strategy to a_1.

If $|\mathcal{B}| = 0$, Claim 9 implies that at least $2n+1$ players choose $b'_1, b'_2, b'_3.b'_4, b'_5$. Thus, some player has the utility at most $0 < \alpha$.

If $1 \leq |\mathcal{B}| \leq n-1$, Claim 9 implies that at least three players choose $b'_1, b'_2, b'_3.b'_4, b'_5$, and hence there exists a player p_i among the three players who dominates neither b'_1 nor b'_5. Therefore, since we have $1 \leq |\mathcal{B}|$,

$$U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*) \leq -\alpha + \sum_{j \in [2n] \setminus \mathcal{B}} s_j < \alpha.$$

If $|\mathcal{B}| = n+1$, then no player chooses $b'_1, b'_2, b'_3.b'_4, b'_5$. Moreover, since only one player dominates b'_4, there exists a player p_i such that $U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*) \leq \alpha$. However, p_i can dominates $b'_1, b'_2, b'_3.b'_4, b'_5$ by changing the strategy to b'_4, and thus

$$(\alpha+1) + (-1) + (-\alpha) + (\alpha+1) = \alpha + 1 \leq U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, b'_4).$$

By the argument above, we have $|\mathcal{B}| = n$, and hence we have n pairs of players and the other two players. We below show that a pair of players for B_j, for an arbitrary index $j \in \mathcal{B}$, choose $b_{j,1}$ and $b_{j,2}$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that one of the players chooses neither $b_{j,1}$ nor $b_{j,2}$.

If a player chooses $b_{j,3}$, then, since the other player chooses $b_j, b_{j,1}$ or $b_{j,2}$, the utility of the player is $-\alpha < \alpha$.

If no player chooses $b_{j,3}$, there exists a player p_i choosing b_j, and p_i dominates b_j and $b_{j,3}$ together with only one of $b_{j,1}$ and $b_{j,2}$ in B_j. In addition to the three vertices, p_i does or does not dominate b'_4.

In the former case, there must be no player choosing b'_3, b'_4 and b'_5. Consider then the other two players who may choose b'_1 and b'_2. If the two players choose b'_1 and b'_2, one of them has utility zero which is less than α. If only a player $p_{i'}$ chooses one of b'_1 and b'_2,

$$U_{i'}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) \leq \alpha + 1$$

while

$$\begin{aligned} U_{i'}(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i'}, b'_4) &\geq (\alpha+1) + (-1) + (-\alpha) + \sum_{j' \in [2n] \setminus \mathcal{B}} s_{j'} + \alpha + 1 \\ &\geq \alpha + 3. \end{aligned}$$

In the latter case, we have

$$U_{i'}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) \leq (-\alpha + s_j) + (-\alpha) + \alpha = -\alpha + s_j < \alpha.$$

We thus complete the proof.

By Claims 8 and 10, it suffices to consider the other two player choosing vertices in V_B. We complete the proof of Lemma 3 with the following claim.

Claim 11. $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ satisfies (C.2).

Proof. Let p_i and $p_{i'}$ be the two players other than $2n+2$ players satisfying (C.1) and (C.3). Let $S' \subseteq [2n]$ be the set of indicies satisfying (C.1).

We first show that one of p_i and $p_{i'}$ chooses b'_1. Suppose no player chooses b'_1; then Claim 9 implies that at least one of p_i and $p_{i'}$ chooses b'_2, b'_3, b'_4 and b'_5; assume that p_i is such a player. Since Claim 10 implies that any player choosing B_j, $j \in S'$, has utility α; but, the player can obtain, by changing the strategy to b'_1, $\alpha+1$ and does not dominate b'_3 due to p_i.

Let p_i be the player choosing b'_1. We then show that $p_{i'}$ chooses b'_5. If $p_{i'}$ chooses b'_2, b'_3 or b'_4, then $p_{i'}$ can increase the utility by changing the strategy to b'_5 by avoiding b'_3. Otherwise, that is, if $p_{i'}$ chooses a vertex in B_j, $j \in [2n]\backslash S'$, then p_i cannot dominate b'_4 and b'_5, and hence

$$U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}) \leq \alpha + 1.$$

However, by changing the strategy to b'_4, p_i dominates b'_1, b'_2, b'_3, b'_4 and b'_5 together with $B_{j'}$ for every $j' \in [2n]\backslash(S' \cup \{j\})$. Therefore, since $|S' \cup \{j\}| < 2n$,

$$U_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*_{-i}, b'_4) \geq (\alpha+1) + (-1) + (-\alpha) + \sum_{j' \in [2n]\backslash(S' \cup \{j\})} s_{j'} + (\alpha+1) > \alpha + 1.$$

D Proof of Lemma 5

Since the necessity is obvious, we only verify the sufficiency. That is, we show that if (k, G, w) has a Nash equilibrium, then there exist $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \ldots, \kappa_m$ and t such that $k = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \kappa_j$ and P_j admits κ_j players with a common boundary t for every $j \in [m]$. Note that, if a strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s} = (\boldsymbol{s}_1, \boldsymbol{s}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{s}_m)$ is a Nash equilibrium, then it trivially holds that $\nu_{P_j}(\boldsymbol{s}_j) \leq \mu_{P_j}(\boldsymbol{s}_j)$ for any $j \in [m]$.

Consider an arbitrary Nash equilibrium $\boldsymbol{s}$, and let $\boldsymbol{s}_1, \boldsymbol{s}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{s}_m$ be strategy profiles for $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_m$, and $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \ldots, \kappa_m$ be the numbers of players choosing vertices in $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_m$, respectively. Suppose for sake of contradiction that no common boundary t exists for $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_m$ with $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \ldots, \kappa_m$. Let t be an arbitrary integer such that there exists j satisfying $\nu_{P_j}(\boldsymbol{s}_j) \leq t \leq \mu_{P_j}(\boldsymbol{s}_j)$. Then there is at least an index j' such that either $\mu_{P_{j'}}(\boldsymbol{s}_{j'}) < t$ or $t < \nu_{P_{j'}}(\boldsymbol{s}_{j'})$. Let $J'_{<t}$ be the set of indices satisfying the former inequality $\mu_{P_{j'}}(\boldsymbol{s}_{j'}) < t$, and $J'_{t<}$ be the set of indices satisfying the latter inequality $\mu_{P_{j'}}(\boldsymbol{s}_{j'}) < t$.

Consider the case for $J'_{<t} \neq \emptyset$ and $J'_{t<} \neq \emptyset$. In this case, there exists a pair of indices $j'_1 \in J_{<t}$ and $j'_2 \in J'_{t<}$ such that $\mu_{P_{j'_1}}(\boldsymbol{s}_{j'_1}) < \nu_{P_{j'_2}}(\boldsymbol{s}_{j'_2})$. Thus, a player in $P_{j'_1}$ can increase the utility by changing the strategy to a vertex in $P_{j'_2}$.

Consider the other case $J'_{<t} = [m]$ or $J'_{<t} = [m]$. If $J'_{<t} = [m]$, there exists an index $j' \in [m]$ such that $\mu_{P_{j'}}(\boldsymbol{s}_{j'}) < \nu_{P_j}(\boldsymbol{s}_j)$; otherwise we can choose

$$t = \min_{j' \in [m]} \mu_{P_{j'}}(\boldsymbol{s}_{j'})$$

as the common boundary. Thus, a player in $P_{j'}$ can increase the utility by changing the strategy to a vertex in P_j. Similarly, if $J'_{t<} = [m]$, there exists an index $j' \in [m]$ such that $\mu_{P_j}(\boldsymbol{s}_j) < \nu_{P_{j'}}(\boldsymbol{s}_{j'})$; otherwise we can choose

$$t = \max_{j' \in [m]} \nu_{P_{j'}}(\boldsymbol{s}_{j'})$$

as the common boundary. Thus, a player in P_j can increase the utility by changing the strategy to a vertex in $P_{j'}$.

E Proof of Lemma 6

We give such an algorithm as a proof of Lemma 6. Suppose that we are given a path P of n vertices, together with its weight function w and a nonnegative integer t.

We first note that it is easy to determine whether P admits zero player with the boundary t. In this case, there is only one strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s} = \emptyset$ for $(0, P, w)$, and $\mu_P(\boldsymbol{s}) = +\infty \geq t$. Thus, $0 \in K$ if and only if $\nu_P(\boldsymbol{s}) = \sum_{v \in V(P)} w(v) \leq t$. Clearly, this can be done in $O(n)$ time. In the following, we thus assume that at least one player exists in the game (κ, P, w).

Idea and definitions.

We label the vertices $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ in the path P from left to right. Our algorithm employs a dynamic programming approach based on the number κ of players in P, and mainly keeps truck of the first and second rightmost vertices that are chosen by some of the κ players in P together with the numbers of players who chose them. However, it should be noted that, because we will add a new $(\kappa+1)$-th player to the right side of the currently rightmost player, the utility of the rightmost player may change according to the addition. Therefore, as a "partial" solution, we introduce the notion of "Nash sub-equilibrium" for a weighted path, as follows.

Let $\boldsymbol{s}$ be a strategy profile for the game (κ, P, w) such that $\kappa \geq 1$. We denote by $r_{\boldsymbol{s}}$ the index $1 \leq r_{\boldsymbol{s}} \leq n$ such that $v_{r_{\boldsymbol{s}}}$ is the rightmost vertex chosen by at least one player in $\boldsymbol{s}$. Let $Q_{\boldsymbol{s}}$ be the set of all players in $\boldsymbol{s}$ who did not choose $v_{r_{\boldsymbol{s}}}$; we denote by $\mu(\boldsymbol{s}; Q_{\boldsymbol{s}})$ the minimum utility over all players in $Q_{\boldsymbol{s}}$. For two integers x and y, $0 \leq y < x \leq n$, let $\nu(\boldsymbol{s}; y, x) = \max_{y \leq j \leq x} U_{\kappa+1}(\boldsymbol{s} + v_j)$. In other words, $\nu(\boldsymbol{s}; y, x)$ denotes the potential of the maximum utility under $\boldsymbol{s}$ that can be expected to gain by an extra player other than the κ players when the extra player chooses a vertex from $v_y, v_{y+1}, \ldots, v_x$. Then, a strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}$ for the game (κ, P, w) is called a *Nash sub-equilibrium with a boundary t* if and only if

(1) $\nu(\boldsymbol{s}; 1, r_{\boldsymbol{s}}) \leq t$;
(2) $\mu(\boldsymbol{s}; Q_{\boldsymbol{s}}) \geq t$; and
(3) $U_j(\boldsymbol{s}_{-j}, v') \leq U_j(\boldsymbol{s})$ for each player $j \in Q_{\boldsymbol{s}}$ and $v' \in \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{r_{\boldsymbol{s}}}\}$.

We classify the Nash sub-equilibriums with respect to the first and second rightmost vertices chosen by players. For notational convenience, we introduce a dummy vertex v_0. Let κ be an integer such that $1 \leq \kappa \leq 2n$. Then, we say that $\big((x, a), (y, b)\big)$ is a *feasible set on κ* if

- x and y are indices of vertices in $V(P) \cup \{v_0\}$ such that $0 \leq y < x \leq n$; and
- a and b are integers such that $1 \leq a \leq \kappa$ and $0 \leq b \leq \kappa - a$.

For a feasible set $\big((x,a),(y,b)\big)$ on κ, we say that the path P admits a *Nash $\big(\kappa,(x,a),(y,b)\big)$-sub-equilibrium with the boundary t* if and only if there exist a strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}$ for (κ, P, w) such that

(1) $\boldsymbol{s}$ is a Nash sub-equilibrium with the boundary t;
(2) exactly a players in $\boldsymbol{s}$ choose v_x;
(3) if $\kappa - a > 0$, then exactly b players in $\boldsymbol{s}$ choose $v_y \in \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{x-1}\}$;
(4) if $\kappa - a = 0$, then $(y,b) = (0,0)$; and
(5) if $\kappa - a - b > 0$, then $v_y \in \{v_2, v_3, \ldots, v_{x-1}\}$ and each of the $\kappa - a - b$ players in $\boldsymbol{s}$ chooses a vertex from $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{y-1}$.

Then, $\big((x,a),(y,b)\big)$ indicates the first and second rightmost vertices v_x and v_y chosen by players in $\boldsymbol{s}$ and the numbers of players a and b who chose v_x and v_y, respectively. Therefore, the utility $U_j(\boldsymbol{s})$ of a player j who chose v_x can be computed only by $\big((x,a),(y,b)\big)$; let $U_j\big((x,a),(y,b)\big) = U_j(\boldsymbol{s})$ for a Nash $\big(\kappa,(x,a),(y,b)\big)$-sub-equilibrium. Furthermore, $U_j(\boldsymbol{s}_{-j}, v')$ can be computed only by $\big((x,a),(y,b)\big)$ if j is a player who chose v_x and $v' \in \{v_{y+1}, v_{y+2}, \ldots, v_n\}$; let $U_j\big((x,a-1),(y,b);v'\big) = U_j(\boldsymbol{s}_{-j}, v')$. Similarly, $\nu(\boldsymbol{s}; x, n)$ can be computed by $\big((x,a),(y,b)\big)$, indeed only by (x,a); let $\nu'((x,a),n) = \nu(\boldsymbol{s}; x, n)$ for a Nash $\big(\kappa,(x,a),(y,b)\big)$-sub-equilibrium. Then, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 12. *Let $\boldsymbol{s}$ be a strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}$ for the game (κ, P, w) which is a Nash $\big(\kappa,(x,a),(y,b)\big)$-sub-equilibrium with the boundary t for some feasible set $\big((x,a),(y,b)\big)$ on κ. Then, $\boldsymbol{s}$ is a Nash equilibrium for P with the boundary t if and only if*

(1) $\nu'((x,a),n) \leq t$;
(2) $U_j\big((x,a),(y,b)\big) \geq t$ *for a player j who chose v_x; and*
(3) $U_j\big((x,a-1),(y,b);v'\big) \leq U_j\big((x,a),(y,b)\big)$ *for a player j who chose v_x and $v' \in \{v_{y+1}, v_{y+2}, \ldots, v_n\}$.*

Proof. The only-if-part clearly holds, and hence we prove the if-part. Since $\boldsymbol{s}$ is a Nash $\big(\kappa,(x,a),(y,b)\big)$-sub-equilibrium with a boundary t for the game (κ, P, w), it satisfies

(1') $\nu(\boldsymbol{s}; 1, x) \leq t$;
(2') $\mu(\boldsymbol{s}; Q_{\boldsymbol{s}}) \geq t$; and
(3') $U_j(\boldsymbol{s}_{-j}, v'') \leq U_j(\boldsymbol{s})$ for each player $j \in Q_{\boldsymbol{s}}$ and $v'' \in \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_x\}$.

Then, Conditions (1') and (1) ensure that $\nu_P(\boldsymbol{s}) \leq t$ holds. Similarly, Conditions (2') and (2) ensure that $\mu_P(\boldsymbol{s}) \geq t$ holds. Furthermore, Conditions (2') and (1) imply that no player j in $Q_{\boldsymbol{s}}$ increases the utility $U_j(\boldsymbol{s})$ by moving to a vertex in $v_x, v_{x+1}, \ldots, v_n$. Similarly, by Conditions (1') and (2) no player j who chose v_x moves to a vertex in $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{x-1}$. Together with Conditions (3') and (3), we thus conclude that $\boldsymbol{s}$ is a Nash sub-equilibrium with a boundary t.

We now define our DP table. For a feasible set $\big((x,a),(y,b)\big)$ on an integer $\kappa \in [2n]$, let

$$f_t\big(\kappa,(x,a),(y,b)\big) = \begin{cases} \mathsf{true} & \text{if } P \text{ admits a Nash } \big(\kappa,(x,a),(y,b)\big)\text{-sub-} \\ & \text{equilibrium with the boundary } t; \\ \mathsf{false} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Algorithm.

As the initialization, we first compute $f_t\big(\kappa,(x,\kappa),(0,0)\big)$ for each integer $\kappa \in [2n]$ and $x \in [n]$. Let $\boldsymbol{s}$ be the strategy profile for (κ,P,w) such that all the κ players choose v_x. Then, by the brute-force manner, we can check in $O(n^2)$ time whether $\boldsymbol{s}$ is a Nash $\big(\kappa,(x,\kappa),(0,0)\big)$-sub-equilibrium with the boundary t or not. Therefore, $f_t\big(\kappa,(x,\kappa),(0,0)\big)$ can be computed in $O(n^4)$ time for all integers $\kappa \in [2n]$ and $x \in [n]$.

We then compute $f_t\big(\kappa,(x,a),(y,b)\big)$ for each integer $\kappa \in [2n]$ and its feasible sets $\big((x,a),(y,b)\big)$ such that $b \geq 1$. Suppose that P admits a Nash $\big(\kappa,(x,a),(y,b)\big)$-sub-equilibrium $\boldsymbol{s}$ with the boundary t. Then, by removing the a players who chose v_x, we can obtain another Nash $\big(\kappa-a,(y,b),(z,c)\big)$-sub-equilibrium $\boldsymbol{s}'$ with the boundary t for some feasible set $\big((y,b),(z,c)\big)$ on $\kappa-a$; recall that the utility is not taken into account for the b players who chose v_y in $\boldsymbol{s}'$. Therefore, $f_t\big(\kappa,(x,a),(y,b)\big) = \mathsf{true}$ if and only if there exists at least one feasible set $\big((y,b),(z,c)\big)$ on $\kappa-a$ such that

(1) $f_t\big(\kappa-a,(y,b),(z,c)\big) = \mathsf{true}$;
(2) the utility of each player j who chose v_y is at least t under the condition that a players chose v_x, b players chose v_y and c players chose v_z;
(3) each player j who chose v_y does not move to a vertex in $v_z, v_{z+1}, \ldots, v_x$ to increase its utility under the condition that a players chose v_x, b players chose v_y and c players chose v_z; and
(4) the utility of an extra player j' is at most t under the condition that a players chose v_x, b players chose v_y, and j' chose a vertex from $v_y, v_{y+1}, \ldots, v_x$.

For each feasible set $\big((x,a),(y,b)\big)$ on κ, we check all feasible sets $\big((y,b),(z,c)\big)$ on $\kappa-a$. The conditions (1)–(4) above can be checked in $O(n^2)$ time for one feasible set $\big((y,b),(z,c)\big)$. Then, we can compute $f_t\big(\kappa,(x,a),(y,b)\big)$ in time $O(n^9)$ for all feasible sets $\big((x,a),(y,b)\big)$ on κ.

Finally, we compute the desired set K, as follows: An integer κ is in K if and only if there exists a feasible set $\big((x,a),(y,b)\big)$ on κ such that $f_t\big(\kappa,(x,a),(y,b)\big) = \mathsf{true}$ and Conditions (1)–(3) of Lemma 12 are satisfied. This can be done in time $O(n^7)$.

In this way, our algorithm runs in time $O(n^9)$ in total. This completes the proof of Lemma 6.

F Proof of Lemma 7

Let P be a path of n vertices. We denote by κ and t by the number of players choosing vertices in P and a boundary t, respectively.

Proof for (1): If P admits $\kappa = 0$ with t, then $n \leq t$ holds; otherwise, we have $t + 1 \leq \nu_P(\boldsymbol{s})$. If $n \leq t$ holds, then P clearly admits $\kappa = 0$ with t.

Proof for (2): If P admits $\kappa = 1$ with t, then $t \leq n \leq 2t + 1$ holds, as follows. If $n \leq t - 1$, we have $\mu(\boldsymbol{s})_P \leq t - 1$; and if $2t + 2 \leq n$, then $t + 1 \leq \nu_P(\boldsymbol{s})$ no matter what vertex the player choose.

If $t \leq n \leq 2t + 1$ holds, then P admits $\kappa = 1$ with t by taking a strategy profile in which the player choose the center for odd n (or one of the two centers for even n) of P.

Proof for (3): If P admits $\kappa = 2$ with t, $2t \leq n \leq 2t + 2$ holds, as follows. If $n \leq 2t - 1$, then one of the two player has utility less than t: $\mu(\boldsymbol{s})_P \leq t - 1$. If $2t+3 \leq n$, then $t+1 \leq \nu_P(\boldsymbol{s})$, since the two players must choose two neighboring vertices in any Nash equilibrium $\boldsymbol{s}$.

If $2t \leq n \leq 2t + 2$ holds, P admits $\kappa = 2$ with t, as follows. Consider a strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}$ in which the two players choose the center and a neighbor of P if n is odd n, or do the two centers if n is even. Then, clearly $\boldsymbol{s}$ is a Nash equilibrium, and $\nu_P(\boldsymbol{s}) \leq t$ and $t \leq \mu_P(\boldsymbol{s})$.

Proof for (4): The proof of a similar statement is given in [12], but we give it for completeness.

If P admits $\kappa = 3$ with t, then $t = 1$ and $n = 3, 4$, or 5, as follows. If $n \leq 2$, then at least one of the three players has utility zero: $\mu_P(\boldsymbol{s})$ is not positive. If $n = 3, 4$, or 5, we can easily verify that every Nash equilibrium $\boldsymbol{s}$ satisfies $\nu_P(\boldsymbol{s}) \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\mu_P(\boldsymbol{s}) = 1$, and hence $t = 1$. If $6 \leq n$, we show that no Nash equilibrium exists; there are two cases to consider. If the three vertices are neighboring each other, then the player in the middle must have utility one, but can increase their utility by changing the strategy to the one just to the right (of left) of a vertex outside. If the three vertices are not neighboring, a player choosing leftmost or rightmost vertex can increase the utility by changing the strategy to the one next to the middle.

If $t = 1$ and $n = 3, 4$, or 5, then P admits $\kappa = 3$ with t by taking a strategy profile in which the three players choose the three centers of P.

Proof for (5): We consider only the case for even $\kappa(\geq 4)$, since the proof for the other case is similar.

We define some terms for the proof. Let κ be the number of players, P be the path of n vertices, and w be the weight function. Let $s^{(1)}, s^{(2)}, \ldots, s^{(\kappa)}$ be the vertices the players $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_\kappa$ choose. Without loss of generality, for every i, $1 \leq i \leq \kappa$, we can assume that $s^{(i)}$ is located in the ith position: $s^{(1)}, s^{(2)}, \ldots, s^{(i-1)}$ are to the left of $s^{(i)}$. We denote by δ_0 the number of vertices to the left of $s^{(1)}$; for every i, $0 \leq i \leq \kappa - 1$, by δ_i the number of vertices between $s^{(i)}$ and $s^{(i+1)}$; and by δ_κ the number of vertices to the right of $s^{(\kappa)}$. Clearly, $\delta_0, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_\kappa$ determine the number

$$n = \sum_{i=0}^{\kappa} \delta_i + \kappa \tag{27}$$

and the strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}$ for (κ, P, w). Note that, if $\boldsymbol{s}$ with $\delta_0, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_\kappa$ is a Nash equilibrium, then $\delta_1 = \delta_{\kappa-1} = 0$; otherwise, the first (or the last player) increases

their utility by changing the strategy to the one next to $s^{(2)}(s^{(\kappa-1)})$. Moreover, we can easily observe that if $\mu(\boldsymbol{s}) \leq t \leq \nu_P(\boldsymbol{s})$ holds, we have $t-1 \leq \delta_0 \leq t$ and $t-1 \leq \delta_\kappa \leq t$.

[⇒]

Consider first even κ. We here prove that, if the number n, κ and t do not satisfy Eq. (14), then (κ, P, w) has no Nash equilibrium such that $\mu_P(\boldsymbol{s}) \leq t \leq \nu_P(\boldsymbol{s})$. If $n < \kappa t$, then we have $n/\kappa < t$, and hence no desired strategy profile with a boundary $t \leq \mu_P(\boldsymbol{s})$ exists.

Suppose $(2\kappa-4)t+\kappa < n$, and the desired strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}$ with $\delta_0, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_\kappa$ exists. Since $\boldsymbol{s}$ is a Nash equilibrium, we have $\delta_1 = \delta_{\kappa-1} = 0$, $\delta_0 \leq t$ and $\delta_\kappa \leq t$. Thus, it holds that

$$(2\kappa-4)t + \kappa - 2t = 2t(\kappa-3) + \kappa < \sum_{i=2}^{\kappa-2} \delta_i + \kappa.$$

Therefore, there exists an index i, $2 \leq i \leq \kappa-2$, such that $2t < \delta_i$. Thus, an extra player can gain the utility more than t by choosing the vertex to the right of $s^{(i)}$, and hence $t < \nu(\boldsymbol{s})$, which is a contradiction.

Consider then odd κ. Suppose for sake of contradiction that $n < (\kappa+1)t-1$, and the desired strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}$ with $\delta_0, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_\kappa$ exists. By Eq. (27), we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\kappa} \delta_i + \kappa < (\kappa+1)t - 1,$$

and hence

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\kappa} \delta_i < (\kappa+1)(t-1). \tag{28}$$

On the other hand, since $\boldsymbol{s}$ is a Nash equilibrium with a boundary t, we have

$$t-1 \leq \delta_0, \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_1 = 0; \tag{29}$$

for any even i satisfying $2 \leq i \leq \kappa-1$, we have

$$2t-2 \leq \delta_{i-1} + \delta_i; \tag{30}$$

and

$$\delta_{\kappa-1} = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad t-1 \leq \delta_\kappa. \tag{31}$$

Since κ is odd, we can combine the inequalities in (29)−(31), and obtain

$$(t-1) + (2t-2)\left(\frac{\kappa-3}{2}+1\right) + (t-1) = (\kappa+1)(t-1) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\kappa} \delta_i,$$

which contradicts Eq. (28).

The proof for the inequality $n \leq (2\kappa - 4) + \kappa$ is same as the one for the case where n is even.

[$\Leftarrow$]

We first consider even κ. We prove by construction that, if the number n, κ and t satisfy Eq. (14), then P admits κ players with the boundary t, that is, there exists a strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}$ such that $\boldsymbol{s}$ is a Nash equilibrium for (κ, P, w) and $\nu_P(\boldsymbol{s}) \leq t \leq \mu_P(\boldsymbol{s})$.

For a given n satisfying Eq.(14), we can construct the desired strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}$ with the following designated $\delta_0, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_\kappa$.

The strategy profile $\boldsymbol{s}$: For every i, $0 \leq i \leq \kappa$, the parameter δ_i satisfies

$$\delta_i \in \begin{cases} \{t-1, t\} & \text{if } i = 0; \\ \{0\} & \text{if } i = 1; \\ \{2t-2, 2t-1, 2t\} & \text{if } 2 \leq i \leq \kappa - 2 \text{ and } i \text{ is odd}; \\ \{0, 1, \ldots, 2t\} & \text{if } 2 \leq i \leq \kappa - 2 \text{ and } i \text{ is even}; \\ \{0\} & \text{if } i = \kappa - 1; \\ \{t-1, t\} & \text{if } i = \kappa. \end{cases} \tag{32}$$

Besides, there is an index i^*, $0 \leq i^* \leq \kappa$ such that $\delta_0, \delta_1, \ldots \delta_{i^*-1}$ have their maximum values, while $\delta_{i^*+1}, \delta_{i^*+2}, \ldots \delta_\kappa$ have their minimum values.

If $i^* = 0$ and δ_0 has the minimum value (i.e., $\delta_{i^*} = \delta_0 = t - 1$), then the strategy determines

$$\begin{aligned} n &= (t-1) + \left(\frac{\kappa - 4}{2} + 1\right)(2t-2) + (t-1) + \kappa \\ &= \kappa t. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

If $i^* = \kappa$ and δ_κ has the maximum value (i.e., $\delta_{i^*} = \delta_\kappa = t$), then the strategy determines

$$\begin{aligned} n &= t + (\kappa - 4 + 1)\, 2t + t + \kappa \\ &= (2\kappa - 4)t + \kappa. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

To obtain P of n vertices, we can increment the number of vertices one by one from Eq. (33) to Eq. (34) according to the following procedure: if δ_{i^*} is less than its maximum value, we just increment δ_{i^*} by one; otherwise, we increment δ_{i^*+1} by one, and $i^* + 1$ is now considered to be new i^*. It now remains to show that $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is always a Nash equilibrium and $\nu_P(\boldsymbol{s}) \leq t \leq \mu_P(\boldsymbol{s})$.

We can prove that $\boldsymbol{s}^*$ is always a Nash equilibrium, as follows. For every i, $1 \leq i \leq \kappa$, we can easily observe that

$$t \leq U_i(\boldsymbol{s}); \tag{35}$$

and for every i, $0 \leq i \leq \kappa$, we have $\delta_i \leq 2t$. Thus, any player p_i cannot obtain the utility more than t by changing the strategy to one of $\delta_{i'}$ vertices between $s^{(i')}$ and $s^{(i'+1)}$ where $i' \leq i - 2$ or $i + 1 \leq i'$. Complementally, if p_i changes the

strategy to one of $\delta_{i-1} + \delta_i + 1$ vertices between $s^{(i-1)}$ and $s^{(i+1)}$, the utility of p_i is always $\lfloor (\delta_{i-1} + \delta_i)/2 \rfloor$, since our construction implies that one of δ_{i-1} and δ_i is even. Thus, $\boldsymbol{s}$ is a Nash equilibrium.

Similarly, for every i, $0 \leq i \leq \kappa$, we have $\delta_i \leq 2t$, and hence $\nu_P(\boldsymbol{s}) \leq t$, while Eq. (35) implies that $t \leq \mu_P(\boldsymbol{s})$.

For the case where κ is odd, we can verify, in the same way, the statement by replacing (32) with

$$\delta_i \in \begin{cases} \{t-1, t\} & \text{if } i = 0; \\ \{0\} & \text{if } i = 1; \\ \{2t-2, 2t-1, 2t\} & \text{if } 2 \leq i \leq \kappa - 3 \text{ and } i \text{ is odd}; \\ \{0, 1, \ldots, 2t\} & \text{if } 2 \leq i \leq \kappa - 3 \text{ and } i \text{ is even}; \\ \{2t-2, 2t-2, 2t\} & \text{if } i = \kappa - 2; \\ \{0\} & \text{if } i = \kappa - 1; \\ \{t-1, t\} & \text{if } i = \kappa. \end{cases} \tag{36}$$